

PATENT

Atty. Docket No.: ROC920000132US1 (IBM/155)

Confirmation No. 5587

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence for Application No. 09/659,258 is being electronically transmitted to the Technology Center 2173, via EFS-WEB, on August 9, 2007.

/Scott A. Stinebruner/  
Scott A. Stinebruner, Reg. No. 38,323

August 9, 2007  
Date

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant:	Gregory Richard Hintermeister et al.	Art Unit:	2173
Application No.:	09/659,258	Examiner:	Namitha Pillai
Filed:	September 11, 2000		
For:	PICTORIAL-BASED USER INTERFACE MANAGEMENT OF COMPUTER HARDWARE COMPONENTS		

---

**COMMUNICATION**

Mail Stop RCE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This paper is submitted in follow-up to the telephonic interview conducted between the Examiner and the undersigned on August 8, 2007. This paper is also being accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) requesting that the Amendment After Final, dated August 1, 2007, be entered on the record. A Request for a one-month Extension of Time is also being submitted concurrently herewith, and therefore this response is timely filed.

In the aforementioned telephonic interview, Applicants highlighted the differences between the amended claims and the references cited by the Examiner. Applicants argued, in particular, that the prior art of record does not disclose or suggest indicating the selected status of multiple hardware components in a manner that includes selecting a filter criterion from a plurality of predetermined filter criteria, comparing attributes associated with hardware components against the selected filter criterion, and selecting those hardware components associated with attributes that match the selected filter criterion. Applicants in particular noted that Fig. 8 of Fox, which was previously relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting claim 7, does not in fact disclose the use of a filter criterion in connection with indicating the selected status of a plurality of hardware components. Fig. 8 of Fox, in contrast, enables specific configuration parameters of a single node to be configured by a

user. It is Applicants' understanding from the interview that the Examiner acknowledged that Fox does not in fact disclose filtering as a means of indicating a selected status for multiple hardware components. The Examiner therefore indicated that the claims as amended overcame the current rejections; however, the Examiner indicated that a further search and consideration would be required prior to allowance of the Application.

In summary, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the foregoing, or which might otherwise further this case onto allowance, the Examiner may contact the undersigned at (513) 241-2324. Moreover, if any other charges or credits are necessary to complete this communication, please apply them to Deposit Account 23-3000.

Respectfully submitted,

August 9, 2007  
Date

/Scott A. Stinebruner/  
Scott A. Stinebruner  
Reg. No. 38,323  
WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, L.L.P.  
2700 Carew Tower  
441 Vine Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
(513) 241-2324